



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/584,968	06/30/2006	Aaron Kaplan	ANVIL.001BNP1	9697

20995 7590 07/09/2008
KNOBBE MARTENS OLSON & BEAR LLP
2040 MAIN STREET
FOURTEENTH FLOOR
IRVINE, CA 92614

EXAMINER

DORNBUSCH, DIANNE

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

3773

NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
-------------------	---------------

07/09/2008

ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

jcartee@kmob.com
eOAPilot@kmob.com

Interview Summary	Application No. 10/584,968	Applicant(s) KAPLAN ET AL.	
	Examiner DIANNE DORNBUSCH	Art Unit 3773	

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) DIANNE DORNBUSCH. (3) GERARD VON HOFFMANN.

(2) JACKIE HO. (4) H. RICHARD DAVIS.

Date of Interview: 30 June 2008.

Type: a) ☐ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference
c) ☒ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☐ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☒ Yes e) ☐ No.
If Yes, brief description: A prototype of the device was exhibit, specifically the branch component that contains the fronds and the circumferential link. A balloon catheter with the stent was also shown as well as a video of a procedure using the device.

Claim(s) discussed: 14.

Identification of prior art discussed: Callol et al. (2003/0125802) and Vardi et al. (6,325,826).

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☒ was reached. g) ☐ was not reached. h) ☐ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Independent claim 14 was discussed in order to find a way to overcome the references cited above. It was suggested to applicant to include more structural limitations of the fronds and the circumferential link such as adding that the fronds are axial connections. It was also suggested that functional limitations of the fronds and the circumferential link should be added in order to overcome the references cited above.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

/Dianne Dornbusch/
Examiner, Art Unit 3773

Examiner's signature, if required

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.